REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 18-35 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 36-38 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated Shishizuka et al. '916. Claims 1-6, 9, 11-14 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco '202. Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Gu '988. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Sawanobori '980. Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Truc et al. '924. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Yamasaki '353. Claims 18-22, 24, 27, 29 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Truc et al. Claims 25-26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Difrancesco and Truc et al., further in view of Gu '988. Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco and Truc et al., further in view of Sawanobori '980. Claim 35 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco and Truc et al., further in view of Yamasaki '353.

Referring to the rejection of claims 18-35 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, claim 18 has been amended to correct the informality noted on page 2, paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Therefore, claims 18-35 are in compliance with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Referring to the rejection of claims 36-38 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shishizuka et al. '916, the reference to Shishizuka et al. is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by the claimed invention. More specifically, claim 36 requires a film scanning system that comprises a computer; a high-speed interface coupled to the computer; and a scanner coupled to the high-speed interface. The scanner comprises a plurality of subsystems in communication with the computer through the high-speed interface, with each subsystem including a microprocessor which is assigned a unique identifier. The scanner generates pixel data representative of scanned photographic images, and the scanner provides the generated pixel data to the computer through the high-speed interface.

The reference to Shishizuka et al. '916 discloses a "DoEngine" which is mounted on a board 101. This is separate from scanner 103 of

Shishizuka et al. '916 and appears to be part of an interface. This is different from the invention as set forth in claim 36 and described on pages 8-12 of the present specification. More specifically, this is different from the claimed scanner which itself includes a plurality of subsystems in communication with a computer through a separate high-speed interface, with each subsystem including a microprocessor which is assigned a unique identifier. The reference to Shishizuka et al. '916 does not show or suggest a scanner that includes the specific plurality of subsystems as noted above, with each subsystem including a microprocessor that is assigned a unique identifier, and the scanner being connected to a computer via a high-speed interface.

Accordingly, the reference to Shishizuka et al. '916 is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claim 36.

Claims 37-38 depend from claim 36 and set forth further unique features of the present invention which are also not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied reference. Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be allowable.

Referring to the rejection of claims 1-6, 9, 11-14 and 39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco '202, the reference to Difrancesco '202 is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by the claimed invention. More specifically, claim 1 relates to a photographic film scanning system which includes a film-type selection device adapted to manually select a type of film to be scanned; and an adjustment device responsive to the film-type selection device and adapted to automatically change a position of a lens and a position of a light sensor to provide proper focus for the selected type of film.

The reference to Difrancesco '202 discloses a scanning system having a moving lens. In Difrancesco '202, in order to adapt the scan to different size film, a film gate 112 can be moved along a Y axis as shown in Fig. 1. Difrancesco '202 also discloses that a lamp house 108 may be moved with film gate 112, and alternately, when lens 114 is a magnifying lens, the lens can be moved away from a sensor 118. However, the reference to Difrancesco '202 is not believed to show or suggest the specific claimed combination of a film-type selection device and an adjustment device, wherein the adjustment device is responsive to the manual adjustment of the film-type selection device to automatically change the position of both the lens and the light sensor to provide proper focus for the selected type of film. Further, absent Applicants' disclosure, it would not have been obvious to provide for the combination of the film-type selection device and adjustment device in Difrancesco '202, since the reference to

Difrancesco '202 does not suggest the specific elements noted above and the specific feature with regard to moving both the lens and the light sensor.

Accordingly, the reference to Difrancesco '202 is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 9 and 11-14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and set forth further unique features of the present invention which are also not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied reference. More specifically, these claims set forth further features of the film-type selection device and the adjustment device which are not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied reference. Additionally, these claims set forth that the system also includes a speed adjustment device which when taken in combination with the remaining elements, is not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied reference.

Accordingly, claims 2-6, 9 and 11-14 are also believed to be allowable over the applied reference.

Claim 39 relates to a method of scanning a film strip which requires at least the step of manually selecting a type of film to be scanned and changing the position of the lens and the light sensor to provide proper focus for the selected film type. For the reasons noted above, the reference to Difrancesco '202 is not believed to show or suggest the features of claim 39.

Referring to the rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Gu '988, as noted in the office Action, the reference to Difrancesco does not disclose a means for adjusting a gain of the pixel data and an offset of the pixel data. The reference to Gu '988 was cited to show a system and method for color correction. The reference to Gu '988 relates to a system and method for the automatic correction of color video signals, however, the reference to Gu '988 does not correct the deficiencies of Difrancesco with respect to the claimed invention. That is, neither reference shows or suggest the specific features of the scanning system including the film-type selection device and the adjustment device that is adapted to adjust the position of the lens and the light sensor. Further, neither reference shows the elements noted above in combination with the claimed features of the gain adjustment device and the offset adjustment device. Additionally, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted references to achieve the claimed invention, since neither reference suggests the modification of the above-noted references as proposed in the Office Action.

Accordingly, the references to Difrancesco and Gu, whether comsidered individually or in combination, are not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claims 7 and 8.

With reference to the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Sawanobori '980, as noted in the Office Action, the reference to Difrancesco does not disclose a means for displaying a digital representation of the photographic images. The reference to Sawanobori '980 was cited to show a film scanner having a liquid crystal display. However, the reference to Sawanobori '980 does not correct the deficiencies of Difrancesco with respect to the claimed invention. That is, the references to Sawanobori and Difrancesco do not show or suggest the specific combination of elements required by the scanning system of the present invention, including the particulars of the film-type selection device and the adjustment device. Further, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted references to achieve the claimed invention, since neither reference shows or suggests the particulars of the claimed invention as described above.

Accordingly, Difrancesco and Sawanobori, whether considered individually or in combination, are not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claim 10.

Referring to the rejection of claims 15-16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Truc et al. '924, the reference to Difrancesco and its applicability to the claimed invention has been discussed above. The reference to Truc et al. '924 is not believed to correct the deficiencies of Difrancesco with respect to the claimed invention. The reference to Truc et al., whether considered individually or in combination with Difrancesco, would not show or suggest the specific combination of elements required by the film scanning system of the present invention. Further, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted references to achieve the claimed invention as discussed above.

Accordingly, Difrancesco and Truc et al., whether considered individually or in combination, are not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claims 15 and 16.

Referring to the rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Yamasaki '353, the reference to Difrancesco and its applicability to the claimed invention has been discussed above. The reference to Yamaski does not correct the deficiencies of Difrancesco with respect to the claimed invention. Further, even if combinable, both references would fail to show or suggest the specific features of the scanning

system as claimed and discussed above. Also, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted references as suggested in the Office Action, since the references do not show or suggest the specific combination of elements required by claim 17 and claim 1 from which claim 17 depends.

Accordingly, Difrancesco and Yamasaki, whether considered individually or in combination, are not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claim 17.

Referring to the rejection of claims 18-22, 24, 27, 29 and 31-34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco in view of Truc et al., claim 18 relates to a scanner for generating pixel data for photographic media. The scanner comprises first and second inlets, wherein the first inlet is adapted to receive a plurality of types of photographic filmstrips, and the second inlet is adapted to receive slides. Claim 18 further requires film drive means, a first guide track, a second guide track, a light source, a light sensor and a lens. The reference to Difrancesco as noted in the Office Action does not disclose the claimed first and second inlets. The reference to Difrancesco as also set forth in the Office Action does not disclose the claimed guide tracks. The reference to Truc et al. does not correct the deficiencies of Difrancesco with regard to the claimed invention. That is, the reference to Truc et al. even if combinable with Difrancesco would not show or suggest the specific combination of elements required by claim 18 and discussed above. Further, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Difrancesco and Truc et al. to achieve the claimed invention, since neither reference shows or suggests the combination of elements required by claim 18. That is, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the references as suggested in the Office Action, due to the fact that the references themselves do not suggest a motivation for the combination.

Accordingly, Difrancesco and Truc et al., whether considered individually or in combination, are not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claim 18.

Dependent claims 19-22, 24, 27, 29 and 31-34 set forth additional unique features of the present invention which are also not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied references. More specifically, these claims set forth further features of the scanner of the present invention, including the scanner comprising film-type selection means, a film-color selection means, and a film-speed adjustment means.

Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be allowable.

Referring to the rejection of claims 25-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco and Truc et al., further in view of Gu '988, the above-noted references and their applicability to the claimed invention have been discussed above. As also discussed above, the above-noted references, whether considered individually or in combination, do not show or suggest the specific claimed combination of elements. Additionally, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted reference to achieve the claimed invention, since the references themselves do not suggest a motivation for the combination.

Accordingly, Difrancesco, Truc et al. and Gu, whether considered individually or in combination, are not believed to show or suggest the limitations of claims 25 and 26.

Referring to the rejection of claim 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco and Truc et al., further in view of Sawanobori, the above-noted references and their applicability to the claimed invention have been discussed above. It is noted that the above-references, whether considered individually or in combination, would not show or suggest the features of the scanner as claimed and described above. Further, absent Applicants' disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted references to achieve the claimed invention.

Therefore, Difrancesco, Truc et al. and Swanobori, whether considered individually or in combination, would not show or suggest the features of claim 28.

Referring to the rejection of claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Difrancesco and Truc et al., further in view of Yamasaki '353, the reference to Yamasaki is not believe to correct the deficiencies of Difrancesco and Truc et al. with regard to the claimed invention. Further, absent Applicant's disclosure, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the above-noted references to achieve the claimed invention, since the references do not provide a suggestion for the proposed modification.

Accordingly, Difrancesco, Truc et al. and Yamasaki, whether considered individually or in combination, are not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claim 35.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is submitted that the inventions defined by each of claims 1-39 are patentable, and a favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Novais
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,324

DAN/ld
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2727
Facsimile: 585-477-1148